

REMARKS

In the above referenced Office Action, the Examiner divided the claims into the following groups:

Groups I, Claims 54-190, drawn to an apparatus for processing a single wafer;

Group II, Claims 191, drawn to a method of treating a wafer.

In response, the applicants elect Group I without traverse. The 3 October 2001 amendment that added claims 54-191 also included claims 192-195 as set forth above. As these claims depend from claim 191 and also relate to a method, the undersigned assumes that the Examiner would have included them in Group II.


New claim 196 is drawn to means for practicing the process of claim 191. As such, this claim should be examined with Group I and claims 191-195 should be rejoined if this claim is allowed. MPEP §806.05(e).

The undersigned also notes that the Examiner has classified processes of treating eyeglass lenses as materially different from methods of treating a wafer. The undersigned will keep this material difference in mind during prosecution of this application and any continuing applications.

No fees are believed due with this communication. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized and requested to charge any deficiency in fees herein to Deposit Account No. 50-0665.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP

Date: 10 SEPT 04



Edward S. Hotchkiss
Registration No. 33,904

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000